

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1 and 3 to 17 remain active in this application.

The Examiner's objection to the amendment to the specification is correct. Accordingly, the paragraph has been restored to its original wording except for the underline which is a redundancy, but improves readability to overcome the objection under 35 U.S.C. 132. The error is regretted.

In view of the amendment to the specification and claims, it is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph of claims 1 and 3 to 17 is no longer in order.

Claims 1 and 3 to 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 is readable on the disclosure as follows:

A field effect transistor comprising:
a region of semiconductor material doped a first conductivity type (well 16 is doped p-type, page 5, line 15);
spaced apart source/drain pockets of said first conductivity type (pockets 32 are p-type, page 6, line 10), said source/drain pockets disposed in said region of semiconductor material (16) and counterdoped regions of opposite conductivity type disposed within said source/drain regions forming source/drains (source/drain pockets (regions 34, page 6, lines 22 to 25, the counterdoping resulting from implanting the n-type material into the p-type pockets 32);
a channel region disposed in said region of semiconductor material between said source/drain regions, said channel region having a first region of one of undoped or doped opposite conductivity type and a second doped region underlying the first region of said opposite conductivity type page 5, line 29 to page 6, line 1), said second doped region being the primary conduction channel of said transistor and having a greater charge-carrier mobility than said first region (page 3, lines 14 to 19), said second doped region being the primary conduction channel between said source and said drain (page 7, lines 3 to 5).

It is therefore clear that claim 1 is readable on the specification as originally filed.

With reference to claim 9, this claim requires that the surface doped layer comprises a first concentration of a dopant, and wherein the subsurface-doped layer comprises a second concentration of the dopant, the first concentration being greater than the second concentration. This subject matter is found at page 5, lines 27 to 31. It follows that since the layer 26 has implant on top of the prior doping to form region 24 that the region 26 has a greater doping concentration and this is exactly what is set forth in originally filed claim 9. Claim 9 has never been amended.

Claims 1 and 3 to 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enabling requirement. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully noted that at page 7, lines 5 to 7, it is stated that "[s]ubsurface doped layer 26 has greater charge-carrier mobility than conventional surface channels (the undoped or doped surface layer which is conventionally doped).

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor
Reg. No. 19906
(202) 639-7713